

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	Ю.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,319		10/06/2003	Tai-Cheng Yu		5458
25859	7590	03/22/2005		EXAMINER	
WEI TE			KIM, RICHARD H		
		RNATIONAL, INC.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1650 ME				ART UNIT	FAFER NUMBER
SANTA (CLARA,	A, CA 95050		2871	
				DATE MAIL ED. 02/22/2004	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			HIP
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/680,319	YU ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
(Richard H. Kim	2871	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	sears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a r ly within the statutory minimum of thirt will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a)☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☒ This 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	— s action is non-final. nce except for formal matt	• •	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		•
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 October 2003</u> is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ o drawing(s) be held in abeyar tion is required if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in A nity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	C		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/6/03. 	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-5, 8-10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (US 5,986,730) in view of Motomura et al. (US 6,724,446 B2).

Referring to claim 1-3, 8-10 and 13, Hansen et al. discloses a device comprising a liquid crystal panel having a reflective polarizing element (Fig. 1, ref. 15); and a backlight module having a light source for emitting light beams, a light guide plate for receiving and transferring light beams, a reflector (col. 7, lines 58-62), and a quarter wave plate for changing the polarization state of the light beams attached to the upper surface of the light guide plate (Fig. 1, ref. 25), the light guide plate (21) and the quarter wave plate being stacked together in order; the quarter-wave plate being attached to an upper surface of the light guide plate (23); wherein the liquid crystal panel is located on the backlight module (Fig. 1, ref. 11-13), and the reflecting polarizing element of the liquid crystal panel faces toward the quarter-wave plate of the backlight module (Fig. 1, ref. 15). However, the reference does not disclose that the light source is disposed adjacent to the light guide plate, wherein the reflector is attached to the bottom surface of the light guide plate.

Motomura et al. discloses a light source disposed adjacent to the light guide plate, wherein the reflector is attached to the bottom surface of the light guide plate (Fig. 1, ref.13, 11).

Art Unit: 2871

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the light source to be disposed adjacent to the light guide plate, and the reflector attached to the bottom surface of the light guide plate since one would be motivated to provide uniform illumination over the surface of the display panel.

Referring to claim 4, Hansen et al. discloses the device previously recited. Hansen further discloses a diffuser (col. 6, lines 71), but fails to disclose that the diffuser is disposed between the liquid crystal panel and the quarter wave plate.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the diffuser to be disposed between the liquid crystal panel and the quarter wave plate since the diffuser, independent of its arrangement in the liquid crystal device, acts to diffuse light, and therefore improves uniformity. Therefore, placing the diffuser between the liquid crystal panel and the quarter-wave plate would be functionally equivalent.

Referring to claim 5, Hansen and Motomura et al. dislose the device previously recited, but fails to disclose a brightness enhancing film.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ brightness enhancing film since brightness enhancing film are well known in the art to enhance the brightness of the liquid crystal display.

Referring to claim 14, Hanen and Motumura et al. disclose the method previously recited, but fails to disclose the method wherein in a light a p-polarization component is reflected by the reflective polarizing element, and passes the quarter-wave plate twice and the reflector once, thus resulting in a conversion of "a p-polarization component to clockwise circular polarization component to a counter clockwise polarization component to an s-polarization component"

Art Unit: 2871

before the reflected and reformed p-polarization component hits the reflective polarizing element again (Fig. 1). Since structurally, Hansen and Motomura et al. discloses the claimed subject matter, the light would therefore act in the same manner as described.

3. Claims 6,7, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. and Motomura et al. in view of Wang et al. (US 5,982,464).

Hansen et al. and Motomura et al. disclose the device previously recited, but fails to disclose that the quarter-wave plate is made of polyvinyl alcohol or mica.

Wang et al. discloses a quarter-wave plate made of mica (col. 4, lines 40-41).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the quarter-wave plate to be made of mica since mica is well known in the art as an effective quarter-wave plate material due to its refractive index and transparent properties. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the quarter-wave plate to be made of polyvinyl alcohol since applicant has claimed multiple embodiments of the material in which the quarter wave plate is made. Therefore, it is evident that the material to make the quarter-wave plate is not a critical limitation.

Art Unit: 2871

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Richard H. Kim whose telephone number is (571)272-2294. The

examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-6:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on (571)272-2293. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Richard H Kim Examiner

Art Unit 2871

RHK

ROBBAY H. KIM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 5

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800